

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING

by

L. Alan Witt, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology  
Western Illinois University  
Macomb, Illinois 61455

for

The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute  
Patrick Air Force Base, Florida

United States Navy-ASEE 1989  
Summer Faculty Research Program

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author and should not be construed as an official Department of Defense or Department of the Navy position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.

## Acknowledgements

The efforts of several individuals facilitated the preparation of this report. Colonel Patrick D. Conner supported the idea behind and solicited staff participation in the staff survey. Lieutenant Colonel Mickey Dansby, USAF: (a) promoted this research topic, (b) provided considerable conceptual and methodological feedback, (c) identified a number of information sources, (d) provided opportunities to collect needed data, and (e) established a favorable work climate. Ms. Mary Anne O'Neill performed a variety of tasks that made possible the research effort, including providing an orientation to DEOMI, arranging for housing, piloting a survey and making suggestions for revision, and communicating with personnel in agencies external to DEOMI. Lieutenant Joseph Nobles, USN, and Mr. Jerry Scarpate provided relevant information about DEOMI and military operations and about equal opportunity issues. Barbara Shea provided considerable logistical assistance, particularly in disseminating staff surveys. Mrs. Margaret Nagel answered on many occasions a series of queries regarding DEOMI. Ssgt. Paul Dillner provided assistance with operational use of the mainframe computer. Ms. Connie Morrison and Dr. Lee Missavage of the library provided significant assistance in the acquisition of source materials and conceptual assistance in survey development. In addition, the service liaison officers -- Lieutenant Mark Johnson, USCG, Major Juanita Hamre, USA, Major William Pennick, USMC, Lieutenant Carol Strothers, USN and Captain Margaret Wakin, USAF -- served as consultants to explain DEOMI and equal opportunity issues as relevant to their respective services.

## Assessing the Impact of Equal Opportunity Training

### Abstract

The present paper addresses the organizational effectiveness of the Defense Equal Opportunity Institute (DEOMI). Means to assess the impact of DEOMI's training program are discussed within the framework of a strategic multiple constituencies model of organizational effectiveness. Specifically, recommendations are presented: (a) on how to assess the impact of DEOMI training on military field units at the unit level, (b) for future research to examine equal opportunity citizenship behaviors at the individual level, and (c) for future research to develop models to assess the cost-effectiveness of DEOMI training. In addition, the perceptions of DEOMI's constituencies regarding the institute's effectiveness are discussed.

## Assessing the Impact of Equal Opportunity Training

The present paper addresses the organizational effectiveness of the Defense Equal Opportunity Institute (DEOMI), which is housed at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida. DEOMI's primary mission is to contribute to the federal government's effort to achieve equal opportunity (EO) among military personnel through training and research.

The issue of effectiveness of military and civilian government agencies has received considerable empirical attention in recent years (cf. King, Lau, & Sinaiko, 1983; Salinger & Bartlett, 1983; Salinger & Roberts, 1984; Oliver & van Rijn, 1984), and numerous studies have sought to assess the effects of equal opportunity programs, particularly in the 1970's (Hellriegel & Short, 1972; Jurkiewicz, 1978; Rose & Chia, 1978; Rosenbloom, 1977, 1981; United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1983; Vaughn, 1975). Much of this latter research has focused either on statistical representation of sub-group members in federal organizations or on how much money has been spent, and it has ignored the effects of EO programs on organizational effectiveness.

The issue of the effectiveness of DEOMI is important for at least two reasons. First, circumstances in the Department of Defense (DoD) still suggest the need for trans-services EO training. For example, as noted by Hiett and Nordlie (1978), positive race relations still are not the general pattern in the Army, and in-services training are largely perceived as low priority and "paper" programs. As research suggests that strong interpersonal relationships are necessary for mission readiness in combat units (Gal, 1986; Griffith, 1988, 1989; Henderson, 1985), poor race and between sex (i.e., male and female co-worker) relations may have an adverse impact on mission readiness. Second, in a fiscal environment of constrained resources and given the anticipated demographic changes in the composition of military personnel into the next century, the DoD can ill afford to pursue equal opportunity training that is ineffective. In addition, this objective is in line with calls for research on the measurement of the organizational effectiveness of military units (cf. Lyga, 1982; Nadal, Duey, Ray, & Schaum, 1977; Silva, Ballentine, & Weaver, 1986).

The organization of the present paper is as follows. First, the conceptual and empirical organizational effectiveness literature is briefly reviewed. Second, approaches to assessing the effectiveness of DEOMI are presented. Third, the method by which data was collected is discussed. Fourth, the data is presented and conclusions are discussed.

### ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS LITERATURE

Organizational effectiveness in the management sciences has a long history of intense interest but a short past of empirical study. Literature reviews have emphasized the considerable lack of conceptual and methodological clarity. Indeed, not much has changed since Connolly, Connolly, and Deutsch (1980, p. 211) noted that the "field of

organizational effectiveness research appears to be in conceptual disarray.

Still the rule in organizational science are goal-based definitions (Hall, 1980; Keeley, 1984) and operationalizations (Steers, 1975) of organizational effectiveness. Typical is Etzioni's (1975, p. 135) definition, which suggests that it "establishes the degree to which an organization realizes its goals under a given set of conditions." Essentially, its definition and operationalization form a "socio-political question" (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978, p. 11), such that organizational effectiveness has been viewed as a socially constructed, abstract notion devised by theorists (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983).

Nevertheless, organizational effectiveness is salient to all of organizational research and management practice, as both have it as their bottom line. As noted by Cameron (1986b), effectiveness is the ultimate dependent variable in research on organizations.

#### Models of Organizational Effectiveness

As noted by Goodman, Atkin, and Schoorman (1983, p. 164), "there is, at present, no singular, parsimonious model or theory of organizational effectiveness." In general, researchers have employed four models to define and operationalize effectiveness: (a) the goal attainment model, which assesses the extent to which the organization reaches its goals (Bluedorn, 1980; Price, 1972), (b) the system resource model, which measures the degree to which the organization acquires needed resources (Seashore & Yuchtman, 1967), (c) the health systems model, which measures the internal functioning of the organization's social system (Nadler & Tushman, 1980), (d) the customer satisfaction model, which assesses the degree of satisfaction among the organization's strategic multiple constituencies (Connolly, et al., 1980; Keeley, 1978; Thompson, 1967), and the legitimacy model, which focuses on the role of the organization in the larger environmental context (Miles & Cameron, 1982; Zammuto, 1982). For a review of different organizational effectiveness models, see Lewin and Minton (1986).

The rationale used by managers and researchers in selecting the model that they employ is seldom clear. Differences in models of organizational effectiveness have generally come about from different models of organizations (Cameron & Whetten, 1983a) and from practical considerations unique to each assessment situation (Cameron, 1986b) -- i.e., convenience. However, it clear is that the different models yield very different results.

Both military behavioral scientists (e.g., Gettys & Maxwell, 1981) and organizational effectiveness personnel in the Army and Navy (cf. Oravis, 1982) have tended to focus on the health systems model, emphasizing criteria such as morale, "leadership effectiveness," command climate, and job satisfaction. However, the customer satisfaction or multiple constituencies model has been emphasized in the recent management literature. Typical is Cameron & Whetten's (1983b) argument

that organizational effectiveness criteria should reflect the interests of some important constituency. Cummings (1983) argued that the domain of organizational effectiveness is defined by the opportunities provided by an organization to those dependent on it: 'The distribution and quality of opportunities, given the goals of the dependent units, become the arena with which effectiveness is to be assessed' (p. 195).

Zammuto's definition (1984, p. 614) is similar:

The construct of organizational effectiveness refers to human judgments about the desirability of the outcomes of organizational performance from the vantage point of the varied constituencies directly and indirectly affected by the organization.

The bottom line as delineated by proponents (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978, p. 87) of this approach is 'Who wants what and how important is it for that demand to be satisfied? And what are the implications of the satisfaction of one demand for the satisfaction of other demands?'

The selection of whose demands are to be considered is the key issue. Organizations interact with an extensive network of social systems, and the network influences evaluations (Gerlach & Palmer, 1981). Seashore (1983) identified four classes of value perspectives: (a) perspectives of the various organizational subsystems, (b) perspectives of the organization's members, (c) perspectives of persons outside the organization, and (d) perspectives representing the public or society at large.

There are four approaches to the multiple constituencies model -- the relativist, the power, the social justice, and the evolutionary perspectives (Zammuto, 1984). The relativist perspective (Connally, et al., 1980) holds that selection of any one perspective as the 'right' one is arbitrary and that the multiple constituencies approach is the process of gathering information from various individuals in the organization. The power perspective (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) suggests that the view of the most powerful constituency should be used in the assessment of organizational effectiveness, as their's is critical for organizational survival. The social justice perspective (House, 1980; Keeley, 1978) suggests that the perspective of the least advantaged party should be identified to serve as the standard against which to assess organizational effectiveness. The evolutionary perspective (Zammuto, 1984) suggests that the question of whose preferences at a given time should be met is the issue of how divergent needs are satisfied in the long term. He stressed the importance of long-term organizational effectiveness in a dynamic social context.

#### Organizational Effectiveness Criteria

The 'criterion problem' in organizational science (Smith, 1976) is no where more evident in the measure of organizational effectiveness than elsewhere in the literature. Issues contributing to the lack of clarity are a failure to find a universal criterion of effectiveness and a variety of dimensions through which effectiveness can be viewed. Given these problems, Starbuck and Nystrom's (1983) observation that

judgments about effectiveness tell more about the implicit theories of the rater than about the organization being assessed seems accurate. Indeed, Cameron and Whetten's (1983b) suggestion that measuring organizational effectiveness is necessary for and prior to the understanding of organizational effectiveness is typical of the thinking in the field.

#### In Search of 'the' Criterion of Organizational Effectiveness

As Cameron and Whetten (1983b, p. 274) correctly noted, "there is no algorithm to identify one criteria as being inherently better than another." Indeed, no single statement about organizational effectiveness is possible nor desirable, because: (a) different organizations need different criteria at different times, (b) assessment of effectiveness depends upon which constituencies supply the evaluation criteria, and different organizational constituencies often hold different preferences (Connolly, et al., 1980; Pickle & Friedlander, 1967); (c) many contradictory preferences are typically pursued within an organization (Weick, 1976); (d) individuals frequently are unable to identify their organization's preferences for criteria (Gross & Grambsch, 1968); (e) preferences typically change with time (Miles & Cameron, 1982); and (f) criteria of effectiveness vary with different stages of organizational growth (Quinn & Cameron, 1983; Smith & Gannon, 1987). For these reasons, consensus regarding the appropriate set of effectiveness indicators is impossible to obtain (Cameron, 1986b). Moreover, it is difficult to generalize results of organizational effectiveness studies across situations (Steers, 1977).

Examples of criteria include adaptability, productivity, employee retention or turnover, profitability, deployable strength percentage, number of AWOL's, tardiness, employee morale, development of new products or practices, down time, personnel accident rate, number of grievances, work area cleanliness, readiness, equipment accident rate, absenteeism, absence of organizational strain, capacity to test reality, voluntarism, control over environment, manpower utilization, operating expenses, and a variety of aggregated individual-level perceptions of the organizational situation. Indeed, without a unitary conceptualization of effectiveness, a number of evaluative criteria labelled as "organizational effectiveness" have been put forth (cf. Angle & Perry, 1981; Cameron, 1978; 1980; Campbell, 1977; Campbell, Bownas, Peterson, & Dunnette, 1974; Connolly, Conlon, & Deutsch, 1980; Coulter, 1979; Daley, 1986; Edwards, Faerman, & McGrath, 1986; Engle, 1977; Farace, Monge, & Russell, 1977; Goodman & Pennings, 1976; Gummer, 1985; Hambrick & MacMillan, 1985; Hendrix, 1979; Kapp & Barnett, 1986; Katz & Allen, 1985; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Keeley, 1978, 1984; Keller, 1986; Mahoney & Frost, 1974; Mahoney, & Weitzel 1969; Meister, 1983; Nadal, Duey, Ray, & Schaum, 1977; Ortega, 1987; Price, 1968; Ramanujam, Venkatraman, & Camillus, 1986; Secrist, 1983; Steers, 1975; Steers, Porter, Mowday, & Stone, 1975; Weick & Daft, 1983; Weiner, 1988; Zammuto, 1982, 1984).

### Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness Criteria

Many dimensions of organizational effectiveness criteria have been identified: (a) internal versus external, (b) means versus ends, (c) short versus long-term outcomes; (d) outcomes versus effects, (e) stable versus unstable criteria, (f) effectiveness versus ineffectiveness, (g) organizational performances versus organizational performance, (h) outcomes and effects produced versus what *could be* produced, (i) subjective versus objective assessment, (j) traditional versus non-traditional criteria, (k) a concern for flexibility vs. control, and (l) individual- versus organizational-level criteria.

Internal criteria focus on phenomena within the organization, including turnover and individual performance. External criteria deal with phenomena outside the organization, including effects of the organization on the community or society at large (Dubin, 1976; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Researchers seldom examine both, and internal criteria are typically applied.

Criteria examining the "means" examine the process through which outcomes come about, whereas "ends" criteria focus on the outcomes and ignore the processes. Most studies have not explicitly assessed both (Cameron & Whetten, 1983b; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), and comparison between the two is difficult.

Because of the difficulty in conducting longitudinal studies and of the often immediate need for utility information, studies typically have assessed short- rather than long-term outcomes. This trend is somewhat the result of the "outcomes versus effects" (Cameron, 1986b) debate. As noted by Nord (1983), organizations often use microquality or outcome indices of effectiveness (e.g., adaptation, profit, productivity) to assess the effectiveness of organizations providing social or economic welfare. He argued that macroquality or effects measures (i.e., how the organization provides for the community at large) should be used. Of course, the assessment of effects on such a scale are neither easily nor quickly done.

Steers (1975) emphasized the need for stable as opposed to unstable criteria. Indeed, considerable changes in criteria over time have hampered the effectiveness of longitudinal studies.

Cameron (1986b) pointed out that researchers should take measurement of both effectiveness (e.g., scores in a war game) and ineffectiveness (e.g., number of AWOL's in a company). This practice should help assess the construct validity of the criteria by examining the correlations between them. However, negative indices may be more subject to manipulation in reporting, because of their potential negative impact on the organization. For example, as noted by Fiman (1978), because racial incidents reflect poorly on a commander's career, it is unlikely that they are reported. Thus, while the frequency or intensity of racial incidents may be in theory a useful effectiveness criterion, their measurement in the field may be inconsistent.

Somewhat consistent with the multiple constituencies approach, Ford and Schellenberg (1982) stressed the need to assess organizational performances rather than just organizational performance. This practice

should help organization members clarify their goals and assess their effectiveness. In organizations such as DEOMI that produce very different outcomes (i.e., training vs. research), it is important to assess the outcomes separately or with criteria appropriate to the activity.

While many studies examine outcomes and fewer examine effects, a neglected dimension is what *could be produced* (Brewer, 1983; Mohr, 1983; Nord, 1983). In an organization where the services are intangible and hard to measure, what could be (or isn't being) produced may provide a yardstick against which to measure effectiveness.

A critical issue in operationalizing effectiveness has been whether to make subjective or objective assessment. While objective measures may be more empirically precise, research suggests the utility of subjective assessment when objective indices are unavailable (Daley, 1986; Dess & Robinson, 1984; Hendrix, 1979; Kanter & Brinkerhoff, 1981; Sapienza, Smith, & Gannon, 1988).

Some criteria have been somewhat non-traditional. For example, Witt (1979) developed a list of 40 non-traditional descriptors of high performing systems (HPS) to be used by military commanders to measure unit performance. For example, in his system, HPS personnel will circumvent the rules when necessary in order to facilitate task accomplishment. An advantage of non-traditional measures is that they may better tap the unique organizational situation. However, this practice makes difficult across-organizations comparison.

Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) noted that most organizational effectiveness studies have focused on a concern for flexibility vs. control (adaptation and innovation vs. stability and predictability). This trend is particularly true of studies using internal, outcome criteria.

Organizational decision-makers are predominantly interested in assessing the effectiveness of the organization as a whole rather than in terms of individual behavior. Hence, most criteria are organization-level. Steers (1975) argued that the relationship between individual behavior and organizational effectiveness has been generally ignored. Similarly, Campbell, Bownas, Peterson, and Dunnette (1974, p. 226) noted that an area of neglected research in the study of organizational effectiveness has been the "effects on the organization of significant changes in the kinds of people that are entering it." More recently, however, Schneider (1983) advocated the use of "non-right types" among organizational members as a criterion of organizational effectiveness. While organizational effectiveness has seldom been examined in terms of the people in it (with the exception of measuring individual-level perceptions and affect), evaluations of the impact of training on organizational effectiveness are typically conducted at the level of the individual. For example, the Office of Personnel Management developed a generic evaluation approach -- the participant action plan approach -- that assesses changes in individuals' behaviors due to training (Salinger & Roberts 1984). Unfortunately, as in private industry, the individual-level criteria in evaluations of government military training

programs are predominantly perceptual (Oravis, 1982; Salinger & Bartlett, 1983) or focused on cost (Neal, 1978).

#### ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DEOMI

What are the appropriate means to assess the effectiveness of DEOMI? For several reasons, this question is difficult to address. First, DEOMI is a public organization, and, as noted by Mohr (1983), the missions of most public sector organizations are vague and characterized by a multiplicity of functions not ordered in importance. DEOMI's mission is to "help the Armed Forces attain and maintain the highest degree of mission readiness and organizational effectiveness through the promotion of harmonious relations among all DoD personnel" (Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, undated, p. 1). More specifically, DEOMI is directed to promote equal opportunity among military personnel through training and research. Thus, its mission is not very specific. Second, as is typical in industrial training programs (White, 1981), there is a general lack of performance measures against which to measure training success. This is particularly true in training of leadership and communication issues, because "there is no way that tangible benefits can be directly related to the program" (Kirkpatrick, 1978, p. 8). In other words, defining the criterion of interest presents a considerable challenge.

Simon (1987, p. 7) defined effectiveness from the perspective of human services organizations as either the: (a) "ratio of desired outcomes to total outcomes," (b) "ratio of desired outcomes to a standard," or (c) "ratio of benefits to total outcomes." Alternative to this goal-oriented approach is the notion that DEOMI is Pareto-efficient if no organization other than DEOMI can achieve at least the same amount of outputs with less of the same resources and no additional resources.

The key issue, however, is the identification of the appropriate perspective (i.e., strategic constituency) to assess DEOMI's effectiveness. Of the approaches to examining multiple strategic constituencies mentioned earlier, the relativist perspective is adopted here: The perspectives of all DEOMI constituencies are considered as important. In line with the social justice perspective, the perspective of the least advantaged party, which in this situation may be the individual soldier or sailor dealing with discrimination or harassment, is considered as an important constituency.

#### Previous Assessment of DEOMI's Effectiveness

Although the DEOMI Board of Visitors periodically assess the institute's effectiveness (e.g., their recent assessment of the DEOMI curriculum), little systematic effectiveness studies have been conducted beyond fairly brief measures of perceptions of students, past students, and commanders working with EO advisors. Fiman (1978) conducted the only significant effectiveness assessment of DEOMI in 1976, when it was called the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI).

He interviewed and disseminated surveys to DRRI faculty, EO field personnel, unit commanders, unit personnel, DRRI students, and Army DRRI graduates. His findings included the following: (a) DRRI graduates perceived their training as contributing to their personal growth; (b) DRRI graduates were more aware of race issues than non-graduates; (c) DRRI has been a symbol of non-discrimination in the military for non-whites; (d) the content of training was not aligned with job needs of EO personnel in the field; (e) there was no relationship between existing selection criteria and performance at DRRI or on the job; (f) there was a low quality of control, giving the message that DRRI graduates had not met high standards of performance; (g) phase I of training was perceived to be helpful. Although this study considered the perspectives of several constituencies, DEOMI's impact on the field was not examined. Follow-up studies of this magnitude have not been reported.

#### Criteria of DEOMI Effectiveness

Goodman, Atkin, and Schoorman (1983) noted two classes of organizational effectiveness studies: (a) outcome studies (DV) (e.g., Seashore & Yuchtman, 1967) and (b) determinant studies (IV) (e.g., Khandwalla, 1973). The present paper addresses organizational effectiveness in terms of measuring outcomes of DEOMI training.

Several criteria are available for assessing the effectiveness of DEOMI, namely unit effectiveness, cost, perceptions of students, perceptions of staff, perceptions of the public, perceptions of the DEOMI board of visitors, perceptions of field commanders, perceptions of alums, perceptions of EO officers, and the perceptions of the EO office in the Pentagon. As mentioned earlier, the multiple constituency approach is appropriate here, because DEOMI cannot ignore their interests and survive.

#### Field Unit Effectiveness: Organization Level

In line with its mission, DEOMI's primary constituency is the field unit. Indeed, the key issue is how or to what extent EO or non-racist/non-sexist training have an impact on mission readiness/effectiveness. An assumption implicit in DEOMI's creation was that positive race relations lead to higher levels of unit effectiveness, although no direct test of this hypothesis has been reported. Griesemer (1980), however, reported that improved unit effectiveness led to improved racial climate. As noted by Griesemer and Hart (1983), racial problems cannot be viewed as just racial problems, because they may be symptomatic of other unit problems or of other problems which have yet to manifest themselves.

As unit effectiveness of a line military organization can be assessed only when performing in combat or simulated combat situations, assessors of military organizational effectiveness have frequently examined the operational readiness of units. Formal definitions suggest that operational readiness of a military unit is "measured by its ability to man, equip, and train its forces and to mobilize, deploy, and sustain them as required to accomplish assigned missions" (Meister,

1983, p. A-10}. On a general level, ratings of unit readiness may include personnel readiness, equipment on hand, equipment readiness, and training readiness (Meister, 1983). In this framework, personnel readiness has been addressed in terms of MTOE required strength, available strength percentage, MOS qualified strength percentage, senior grade fill percentage, and personnel turnover percentage.

Similarly, the Army Research Institute produced a rating instrument to assess personnel readiness in the unit for the purpose of providing an estimate of "mission readiness and operational effectiveness" (Meister, 1983, p. A-14). Factor analyses on about 10,000 Army soldiers generated these 21 dimensions of personnel readiness: officer leadership, NCO leadership, immediate supervisor leadership, leadership concern for soldier welfare, promotion policy, rewards and corrective action, leave and pass policies, quality of training, the quality and quantity of materials (tools, equipment, and supplies), job satisfaction, military courtesy and discipline, race relations, unit cohesiveness, sports activities, social activities, freedom from alcohol or drug-related problems, food, confidence in unit, morale, and reenlistment potential. Problems with these measures include the difficulty in developing a small number of composite criteria useful for quantitative analyses and applying some of the measures outside of the Army context.

In a effectiveness study of 60 Army combat units, Griesemer and Hart (1983) used several "objective" measures of unit effectiveness: (a) military police reports, (b) number of AWOL's, (c) number of re-enlistments, military police reports, (b) number of AWOL's, (c) number of re-enlistments, (d) number of sick calls, (e) operating strength percentage, (f) MOS trained percentage, (g) deployable strength percentage, (h) availability of qualified leaders rating, (i) weeks to complete training, (j) overall unit rating, (k) availability of training areas/facilities rating, (l) availability of fuel rating, (m) availability of time rating, (n) availability of ammunition rating, (o) number of article 15's, (p) number of unprogrammed discharges, (q) number of awards, (r) number of promotions, (s) "enlisted turbulence" (measures of turnover), (t) average time in unit, (u) personnel education and experience, (v) the ratio of minorities in the unit receiving promotions to the number statistically expected to receive promotions, (w) the ratio of minorities in the unit receiving article 15's to the number statistically expected to receive article 15's. Of course, some of these objective measures are subject to artifactual manipulation by commanders concerned with career enhancement.

Griesemer and Hart (1983) perceptually assessed unit effectiveness in terms of: (a) percentage of personnel trusted in battle, (b) percentage of personnel willing to fight, (c) percentage of personnel doing high quality work, (d) extent to which the unit is generally quick to use improved work methods, (e) extent to which equipment and resources are adequate, efficient, and well maintained. Somewhat consistent with the assumptions implicit in DEOMI's creation, they reported that racial climate, commitment among enlisted men, and

cohesion among enlisted men accounted for most of the variance in perceptions of unit effectiveness. They suggested commanders can receive early warnings of unit effectiveness by monitoring those variables. Thus, their report provided some empirical justification for DEOMI training. Caution should be employed, however. The use of perceptual measures only may produce results subject to method variance. Another problem is perceiver bias, as their own data indicated that race and rank (enlisted versus officer) moderated relationships between predictors and criteria of unit effectiveness.

Recommendation. In order to assess the effects of DEOMI training on the effectiveness of units where DEOMI-trained EO advisors have been in place, objective, aggregate measures of unit personnel behavior may be used. Fairly objective criteria that may provide indirect indices of the outcomes resulting from a unit's equal opportunity climate include: (a) military police reports of reported intra- or inter-unit disturbances, (b) number of re-enlistments examined for proportional representation of sex and race groups, (c) the ratio of minorities in the unit receiving promotions to the number statistically expected to receive promotions, and (d) the ratio of minorities in the unit involved in reported (to the military police) incidents to the number statistically expected to be involved. These objective measures of personnel readiness may be combined with subjective assessments of the unit personnel in terms of the percentage of personnel trusted in crisis or combat situations. This latter measure is not an aspect of the equal opportunity climate but rather of personnel operational readiness.

#### Field Unit Effectiveness: Individual Level

Constituencies very important to DEOMI are the soldiers and sailors in the field units. Interest in discrimination and harassment among military personnel stems from the fact that it not only prohibits individuals from contributing their skills and energies where needed (i.e., individual productivity) but also limits job and career possibilities for its victims. Thus, individual problems become organization ones.

Consistent with the assumption implicit in most theories of organizational behavior that individual attitudes are predictive of individual behavior, military organizational effectiveness researchers have typically examined individual-level contextually relevant perceptions and affect. In line with this research, a means to assess the impact of equal opportunity training may be to assess the attitudes of individuals in the unit. An appropriate strategy would be to make pre- and post-advisor training assessments of the unit's equal opportunity climate. Landis and Fisher (1987, p. 8) defined equal opportunity climate:

Equal opportunity climate is the expectation by individuals that they will have equal access to opportunities, responsibilities, and rewards within an organization. It is also the expectation that these opportunities, responsibilities, and rewards will be accorded on the basis of a person's abilities, efforts, and contributions; and not on race, color, sex, religion, or national origin.

A problem with this strategy is that individual perceptions of the equal opportunity climate may neither reflect actual behaviors nor be a component of a unit's effectiveness. Fisher (1988; Landis & Fisher, 1987), however, argued that individual perceptions of an organization's equal opportunity climate have a direct impact on unit effectiveness. The point argued here is that while equal opportunity climate may have an impact on unit effectiveness, it is not an index of unit effectiveness.

As noted by Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970), behavioral measures are appropriate criteria of training effectiveness, because they directly assess the phenomena targeted in the training program. On the bottom line, DEOMI training is not designed to change attitudes but rather to change behaviors in order to enhance effectiveness. These behaviors fall into the category of citizenship behaviors.

Individual performance consists of formal task behaviors and citizenship behaviors. The former is assessed by traditional performance appraisal systems and, when aggregated, is often used as an index of organizational effectiveness. The latter are informal, typically unmeasured behaviors reflecting the individual's sense of social responsibility to the organization (cf. Organ, 1988). Examples of citizenship behaviors include helping colleagues who return to work after leave, conserving organizational resources, and tolerating inconveniences without complaint. An emerging body of research suggests that such behaviors may have a significant impact on effectiveness at the organization level (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983).

A specific form of citizenship behaviors relevant to DEOMI's training mission may be labelled *equal opportunity citizenship behaviors*. Examples may include not engaging in and dissuading others from engaging in sexually harassing behaviors, not telling and dissuading others from telling racist or sexist jokes, and not engaging in and dissuading others from engaging in racial or sex discrimination.

These equal opportunity citizenship behaviors may be measured at the individual level. However, in aggregate form, they may serve as an index of unit effectiveness -- an index conceptually related to DEOMI training.

Recommendation. Future research should be directed to assess equal opportunity citizenship behaviors in military units. These behaviors may be universal across different units and services and thus could be used to assess the effect of DEOMI training.

#### Cost

Although costs are generally not included in definitions of effectiveness (Balk, 1975; Price, 1977), a useful means to assess effects of DEOMI training may be to estimate the costs of discrimination and harassment. Costs can be assessed in terms of the costs to the military of EO deficiencies and of the cost of operating DEOMI.

Following Dunnette and Motowildo (1982), it is suggested here that the cost of discrimination on human resource utilization can be identified in terms of: (a) the generalized cost of across-the-board

discrimination that leads to an underutilization of part of the military's labor force (which may affect not only selection/promotion but also attrition via dissatisfaction), and (b) the cost of decreased productivity at the individual level brought about by awkward work relationships, personal discrimination, and sexual harassment.

Recommendation. Research should be conducted by economists to estimate the productivity lost by the military due to discrimination and harassment. In line with notions that effectiveness should include assessment of what could be produced (Brewer, 1983; Mohr, 1983; Nord, 1983), models should be developed to predict what could happen if soldiers and sailors believe that equal opportunity is a phrase rather than an approaching reality (i.e., if they perceive themselves as becoming even more disenfranchised by the military system).

The cost of operating the institute can be assessed using a cost-effectiveness approach. Levin (1975, p. 92) made the distinction between cost-effectiveness and the better known cost-benefit analyses:

A crucial assumption for performing benefit-cost analysis of alternatives is that the benefits or outcomes can be valued by their market prices or those of similar alternatives. Yet, the objectives of many, if not most social programs have no market counterpart.... In such situations the effectiveness of a strategy is expressed in terms of its actual physical or psychological outcome rather than in terms of its monetary value. That is, the monetary measures of resource costs are related to effectiveness of a program in producing a particular impact. When the effectiveness of programs in achieving a particular goals (rather than their monetary values) is linked to costs, the approach is considered cost-effectiveness rather than cost-benefit analysis.

An alternative to examining training costs is the approach of Schmidt, Hunter, and Pearlman (1982). Their formula for estimating the increase in output from a training program is:  $[U = N T SD_Y D_Y - N C]$ , where  $N$  = number of trainees,  $T$  = the average duration of the intervention effect,  $SD_Y$  = standard deviation of performance in dollar terms,  $D_Y$  = the difference in job performance in true score standard deviation units,  $C$  = the mean cost of the training per worker.  $D_Y$  can be assessed by job performance in some jobs, but, in the case of DEOMI graduates, it cannot. However, Asher and Sciarrino (1981) showed that the  $D_Y$  value for a typical training program can be conservatively estimated at .40. Schmidt and Hunter (1983) have recommended as a general rule of thumb that the of 40% of salary be used as a conservative estimate of  $SD_Y$  when time and/or resources do not permit the use of estimating  $SD_Y$ . Problem with this approach include the lack of a relationship between military pay and military tasks, the short-term of EO advisor assignments, and the inability of this approach to handle the potentially significant costs of failure.

Recommendation. Using the cost effectiveness approach, researchers should the compare cost of operating DEOMI to the scores on the unit effectiveness criteria outlined above. These data may then provide additional indices of the effectiveness of DEOMI training.

### Perceptions of DEOMI Board of Visitors

In a letter to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management and Personnel, Lieutenant General William R. Maloney, USMC, Retired -- the Chair of DEOMI's Board of Visitors -- wrote (Maloney, 1988a, p. 1):

Clearly delineated EO policies, with appropriate command emphasis and manpower support, are imperative if we are to maximize organizational cohesiveness and mission effectiveness.

In a follow-up letter, he wrote (Maloney, 1988b, p. 1):

The need to maintain and increase the sensitivity of EO issues at management and command levels is essential if we are to sustain a harmonious work force that is dedicated to our national defense.

The BOV (Maloney, 1988a) has given the institute high marks overall for its day-to-day operations but has suggested some changes in strategy (p. 1):

In today's social environment, total force composition and diminishing assets to maintain military readiness, the importance of EO demands that DoD maintains strong emphasis in this area. The composition of the current DEOMI resident course (7 officers, 90 enlisted) projects the impression that EO is an enlisted program. Recent press, on the other hand, indicates that sexual harassment, in particular, and EO in general, is more a problem within the upper ranks and associated with command policy.

### Perceptions of students

*TBA*

### Perceptions of staff

*TBA, because I want to see the student data first, so that I can decide what information is most appropriate for inclusion.*

### Perceptions of the public

Surprisingly, DEOMI has not received much media attention, and the DEOMI Public Affairs Office has little archival evidence of coverage by non-military media. An exception is an article (White, 1989) on the career and retirement of DEOMI Commandant Colonel Ellsworth E. Wiggins. Of the 15 additional articles in the files of the DEOMI Public Affairs Office, 12 appeared in *Missilier*, one in *Navy Times*, one in *Ladycom*, and one in *The Jewish Week*. Unfortunately, none of these has national exposure to the public-at-large. Therefore, it is likely that most Americans are unaware of DEOMI's existence.

### Perceptions of field commanders

*TBA when Dillner gets the addresses and your surveys go out.*

### Perceptions of alums

*TBA when Dillner gets the addresses and your surveys go out.*

### Perceptions of EO officers

*TBA when I receive a letters from the military EO offices.*

### Perceptions of EO office in pentagon

*TBA when I receive a letter from Col. Kaplan.*

**SORRY ABOUT THE DELAY; I UNDER ESTIMATED THE TURNAROUND TIME FOR CORRESPONDENCE.**

## SUMMARY

*Once I have all of the data, I'll compose a summary. If you have any suggestions for revision (including inclusion of other materials and excision of others), please identify them in your comments.*

## REFERENCES

- Alluisi, E. A. & Meigs, D. K. (1983). Potentials for productivity enhancement from psychological research and development. American Psychologist, 38, 487-493.
- Asher, J. J., & Sciarrino, J. A. (1981). A statistical power analysis for research designs in training. Unpublished manuscript, San Jose State University.
- Balk, W. L. (1975). Technological trends in productivity measurement. Public Personnel Management, 4, 182-133.
- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." Academy of Management Journal, 26, 587-595.
- Brewer, G. D. (1983). Assessing outcomes and effects. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 205-224). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Cameron, K. (1978). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher learning. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 604-629.
- Cameron, K. (1980). Critical questions in assessing organizational effectiveness. Organizational Dynamics, 9, 66-80.
- Cameron, K. (1986a). A study of organizational effectiveness and its predictors. Management Science, 32, 87-112.
- Cameron, K. (1986b). Effectiveness as a paradox: Consensus and conflict in perceptions of organizational effectiveness. Management Science, 32, 539-553.
- Cameron, K., & Whetten, D. A. (1983a). Organizational effectiveness: One model or several? In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 1-26). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Cameron, K., & Whetten, D. A. (1983b). Some conclusions about organizational effectiveness. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 261-278). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Campbell, D. T., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., & Weick, K. E., Jr. (1970). Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Campbell, J. P. (1977). On the measure of organizational effectiveness. In P. S. Goodman, J. M. Pennings & Associates (Eds.), New perspectives on organizational effectiveness (pp. 13-55). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, J. P., Bownas, D. A., Peterson, N. G., & Dunnette, M. D. (1974). The measurement of organizational effectiveness: A review of relevant research and opinion (Contract No. N00023-73-C-0023). Minneapolis, MN: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- Charles, D. (1988). Report asks upgrade of military R&D labs. Science, 239, 1484.
- Connolly, T., Conlon, E. J., & Deutsch, S. J. (1980). Organizational effectiveness: A multiple constituency approach. Academy of Management Review, 5, 211-217.
- Coulter, P. B. (1979). Organizational effectiveness in the public sector: The example of municipal fire protection. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 65-81.
- Cummings, L. L. (1983). Organizational effectiveness and organizational behavior: A critical perspective. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 187-204). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Daley, D. M. (1986). Humanistic management and organizational success: The effect of job and work characteristics on organizational effectiveness, public responsiveness, and job satisfaction. Public Personnel Management, 15, 131-142.
- Davis, J. E. (1980). A plan for the evaluation of leadership training in the United States Army. Alexandria, VA: Defense Technical Information Center: Defense Logistics Agency.
- Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute. (undated). Promoting combat readiness and organizational effectiveness. Patrick AFB, FL: DEOMI Public Affairs Office.
- Dess, G., & Robinson, R. B., Jr. (1984). Measuring organizational performance in the absence of objective measures. Strategic Management Journal, 5, 265-273.
- Dubin, R. (1976). Organizational effectiveness: Some dilemmas of perspective. Organization and Administrative Sciences, 7, 7-14.

- Dunnette, M. D., & Motowildo, S. J. (1982). Estimating benefits and costs of antisexist training programs in organizations. In H. J. Bernardin (Ed.), Women in the work force. (pp. 156-182). New York: Praeger.
- Edwards, R. L., Faerman, S. R. & McGrath, M. R. (1986). The competing values approach for organizational effectiveness: A tool for agency administrators. Administration in Social Work, 10, 1-14.
- Engle, John E. (1977). A study of the relationship between worker attitudes and organizational effectiveness in an Air Logistics Center Maintenance Directorate. USAF Technical Report # AU-AFIT-LS-3-77. Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative analysis of complex organizations. New York: Free Press.
- Farace, R. V., Monge, P. R. & Russell, H. M. (1977). Communicating and organizing. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fein, M. (1986). A program to improve worker productivity. Paper presented at the First Annual Convention of the Society of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.
- Fiman, B. G. (1978). An analysis of the training program of Army personnel at the Defense Relations Institute. (ARI-TR-78-B14). Alexandria, VA: Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Fiman, B. G. (1978). An analysis of the training program of Army personnel at the Defense Relations Institute. (ARI-TR-78-B14). Alexandria, VA: Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Fisher, G. (1988). Equal opportunity climate: Development and validation of an assessment instrument and its relationship with organizational outcomes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi.
- Ford, J. D., & Schellenberg, D. A. (1982). Conceptual issues of linkage in the assessment of organizational performance. Academy of Management Review, 7, 49-58.
- Gal, R. (1986). Unit morale: From a theoretical puzzle to an empirical illustration -- An Israeli example. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 16, 549-564.

- Gerlach, L. P., & Palmer, G. B. (1981). Adaptation through evolving interdependence. In P. C. Nystrom & W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), Handbook of organizational design (Vol. 1; 323-381), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gettys, M. M., & Maxwell, A. G., Jr. (1981). Organizational effectiveness: A comparative analysis between Army and Navy officers. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.
- Goodman, P. S., & Pennings, J. (1976). Toward a framework of organizational effectiveness. AD-A029 327. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie-Mellon University.
- Goodman, P. S., Atkin, R. S., & Shoorman, F. D. (1983). On the demise of organizational effectiveness studies. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 163-186). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Griesemer, H. A. (1980). Racial harmony, leadership, and unit effectiveness in combat units: An exploratory assessment of causal relationships. Research Note 84-71. Presidio of Monterey, CA: Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Field Unit.
- Griesemer, H. A., & Hart, R. J. (1983). Social psychological and institutional correlates of unit effectiveness. Research Note 83-19. Presidio of Monterey, CA: Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Field Unit.
- Griffith, J. (1988). Measurement of group cohesion in U.S. Army units. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 9, 149-171.
- Griffith, J. (1989). The Army's new unit personnel replacement and its relationship to unit cohesion and social support. Military Psychology, 1, 17-34.
- Gross, E., & Grambsch, P. V. (1968). University goals and academic power. Washington, D. C.: Council on Education.
- Gummer, B. (1985). The bottom line: Current perspectives on organizational productivity and performance. Administration in Social Work, 9, 93-107.
- Hall, R. H. (1980). Effectiveness theory and organizational effectiveness. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 16, 536-545.
- Hall, D. T., & Lawler, E. E. III (1969). Unused potential in research and development organizations. Research Management, 12, 339-354.

- Hambrick, & MacMillan, I. C. (1985). Efficiency of product R&D in business units: The role of strategic context. Academy of Management Journal, 28, 527-547.
- Hellriegel, D., & Short, L. (1972). Equal employment opportunity in the federal government: A comparative analysis. Public Administration Review, 32, 851-858.
- Henderson, W. D. (1985). Cohesion: The human element in combat. Ft. McNair, VA: National Defense University Press.
- Hendrix, W. H. (1979). Organizational assessment indices of effectiveness. (AFHRL-TR-79-46). Brooks AFB, Texas: Manpower and Personnel Division.
- Hendrix, W. H., & Halverson, V. B. (1979). Organizational assessment survey assessment package for Air Force organizations. (AFHRL-TR-78-93). Brooks AFB, Texas: Manpower and Personnel Division.
- Hiatt, R. L., Gilbert, M. & Brown, D. K. (1978). An analysis of unit race relations training program in the U. S. Army: Technical Appendix. (ARI-TR-78-B9A). Alexandria, VA: Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Hiatt, R. L., & Nordlie, P. G. (1978). An analysis of unit race relations training program in the U. S. Army. (ARI-TR-78-B9). Alexandria, VA: Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Hirsch, P. M. (1975). Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 20, 327-344.
- House, E. R. (1980). Evaluating with validity. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Jurkiewicz, T. J. (1978). A report on efforts to find systematic racism within the U. S. General Accounting Office. Washington, D. C.: Institute for Applied Public Financial Management, the American University.
- Kanter, R. M., & Brinkerhoff, D. (1981). Organizational performance: Recent developments in measurement. Annual Review of Sociology, 7, 321-349.
- Kapp, J. E., & Barnett, G. A. (1983). Predicting organizational effectiveness from communication activities: A multiple indicator model. Human Communication Research, 9, 239-254.
- Katz, R. (1982). The effects of group longevity on project communication and performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 27, 81-104.

- Katz, R., & Alleh, T. J. (1985). Project performance and the locus of influence in the R&D matrix. Academy of Management Journal, 28, 67-87.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. (2nd edition). New York: Wiley.
- Katzell, R. A. & Guzzo, R. A. (1983). Psychological approaches to productivity improvement. American Psychologist, 38, 468-472.
- Katzell, R. A., Yankelovich, D., Fein, M., Ornati, D. A., & Nash, A. (1975). Work, productivity, and job satisfaction. New York, The Psychological Corporation.
- Keeley, M. (1978). A social-justice approach to organizational evaluation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 272-292.
- Keeley, M. (1984). Impartiality and participant interest theories of organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, 1-25.
- Keller, R. T. (1986). Predictors of the performance of project groups in R&D organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 715-725.
- Khandwalla, P. N. (1973). Viable and effective organizational designs of firms. Academy of Management Journal, 16, 481-495.
- King, B. T., Lau, A. W., Sinaiko, H. W. (Eds.) (1983). Productivity programs and research in U. S. government agencies. Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institute.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1978). Evaluating in-house training programs. Training and Development Journal, 32, 6-9.
- Kopelman, R. E. (1986). Managing productivity in organizations: A practical, people-oriented perspective. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kozlowski, S.W., & Hults, B. M. (1987). An exploration of climates for technical updating and performance. Personnel Psychology, 40, 539-563.
- Landis, D., & Fisher, G. (1987). Construction and preliminary validation of an instrument to measure equal opportunity climate. Contract No. F49620-85-C-0013. Air Force Office of Scientific Research.
- Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). Motivation and organizational climate. Boston: Harvard University.

- Mahoney, T. A., & Frost, P. J. (1974). The role of technology in models of organizational effectiveness. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 11, 122-138.
- Lyga, M. J. (1982). The effects of organizational level, sex, and race on Air Force organizational effectiveness. Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH: Air Force Institute of Technology.
- Mahoney, T. A., & Weitzel, W. (1969). Managerial models of organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 14, 357-365.
- Maloney, W. R. (1988a). Letter to Grant S. Green, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management and Personnel. March 17.
- Maloney, W. R. (1988b). Letter to Grant S. Green, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management and Personnel. May 31.
- Marrow, Alfred J., Bowers, David J., & Seashore, Stanley E. (1967). Management by participation: Creating a climate for personal and organization development. New York: Harper and Row.
- McCarrey, M. W., & Edwards, S. A. (1973). Organizational climate conditions for effective research scientist role performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9, 439-459.
- Meister, D. (1983). Behavioral correlates of system operational readiness (SOR): Summary of workshop proceedings. NPRDC Special Report 84-5. San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- Miles, R. H., & Cameron, K. S. (1982). Coffin nails and corporate strategies. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Miller, D. B. (1970). How to improve the performance and productivity of the knowledge worker. Organizational Dynamics, 5, 62-80.
- Miller, G. A. (1967). Professional bureaucracy: Alienation among industrial scientists and engineers. American Sociological Review, 32, 755-767.
- Mohr, L. B. (1983). The implications of effectiveness theory for managerial practice in the public sector. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 225-240). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Muckler, F. A. (1982). Evaluating productivity. In M. D. Dunnette and E. A. Fleishman (Eds.), Human performance and productivity, (pp. 13-48) Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

- Nadal, R. A., Duey, W. E., Ray, R., & Schaum, F. W. (1977). Organizational effectiveness in the U.S. Army. Washington, D. C.: Office of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.
- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1980). A congruence model for organizational assessment. In E. E. Lawler, D. A. Nadler, & P. Cammann (Eds.), Organizational assessment: Perspectives on the measurement of organizational behavior and the quality of working life. (pp. 261-278). New York: Wiley.
- Neal, G. L. (1978). Cost and training effectiveness analysis. Educational Technology, March, 15-19.
- Nord, W. R. (1983). A political-economic perspective on organizational effectiveness. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 95-134). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Oliver, L. W., & van Rijn, P. (1984). An overview of productivity improvement efforts in Army organizations. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute.
- Oravis, J. W. (1982). A framework for assessing initial organizational development training in the U. S. Navy and U. S. Army. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behaviors: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Lewin, A. Y., & Minton, J. W. (1986). Determining organizational effectiveness: Another look, and an agenda for research. Management Science, 32, 514-538.
- Ortega, D. F. (1987). Organizational ideology: Its relationship to organizational performance in a social service agency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Pearlman, K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1980). Validity generalization results for tests used to predict job proficiency and training success in clerical occupations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 373-406.
- Peters, L. H., & O'Connor, E. J. (1980). Situational constraints and work outcomes: The influences of a frequently overlooked construct. Academy of Management Journal, 5, 391-397.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). The external control of organizations. New York: Harper and Row.

- Pickle, H., & Friedlander, F. (1967). Seven societal criteria of organizational success. Personnel Psychology, 20, 165-178.
- Price, J. L. (1968). Organizational effectiveness. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Price, J. L. (1972). The study of organizational effectiveness. Sociological Quarterly, 13, 3-15.
- Price, J. L. (1977). The study of turnover. Ames, Iowa: University of Iowa.
- Pritchard, R. D., Jones, S. D., Roth, P. L., Stuebing, K. K., & Ekeberg, S. E. (1987). Organizational productivity measurement: The development and evaluation of an integrated approach. AFHRL-TP-86-64. Brooks AFB, Texas: Manpower and Personnel Division.
- Pritchard, R. D., Jones, S. D., Roth, P. L., Stuebing, K. K., & Ekeberg, S. E. (1987). Feedback, goal-setting, and incentives effects on organizational productivity. AFHRL-TP-87-3. Brooks AFB, Texas: Manpower and Personnel Division.
- Pritchard, R. D., Jones, S. D., Roth, P. L., Stuebing, K. K., & Ekeberg, S. E. (1987). Managers' guide to the implementation of feedback, goal-setting, and incentive systems. AFHRL-TP-87-40. Brooks AFB, Texas: Manpower and Personnel Division.
- Pritchard, R. D., Jones, S. D., Roth, P. L., Stuebing, K. K., & Ekeberg, S. E. (1989). The evaluation of an integrated approach to measuring organizational productivity. Personnel Psychology, 42, 69-115.
- Quinn, R. E., & Cameron, K. (1983). Life cycles and shifting criteria of effectiveness: Some preliminary evidence. Management Science, 29, 33-51..
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. Management Science, 29, 363-377.
- Ramanujam, V., Venkatraman, N., & Camillus, J. C. (1986). Multi-objective assessment of effectiveness of strategic planning: A discriminant analysis approach. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 347-372.
- Romzek, B. S. (1985). Perceptions of agency effectiveness as the basis for differences in organizational involvement: A research note. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 6, 76-85.

- Rose, W., & Chia, T. (1978). The impact of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 on black employment in the federal service: A preliminary analysis. Public Administration Review, 38, 245-251.
- Rosenbloom, D. H. (1977). Federal equal employment opportunity: Politics and public personnel administration. New York: Praeger.
- Rosenbloom, D. H. (1981). Federal equal employment opportunity: Is the polarization worth the preference? Southern Review of Public Administration, 5, 63-72.
- Rosenbloom, D. H. (1984). What policy studies have told us about affirmative action and where can we go from here? Policy Studies Review, 4, 43-48.
- Salinger, R., & Bartlett, J. (1983). Evaluating the impact of training: A collection of federal agency evaluation practices. Washington, D.C.: Office of Personnel Management.
- Salinger, R., & Roberts, C. (1984). Evaluating the impact of training: A collection of federal agency evaluation practices (Vol. 2). Washington, D.C.: Office of Personnel Management.
- Sapienza, H. J., Smith, K. G., & Gannon, M. J. (1988). Using subjective evaluations of organizational performance in small business research. American Journal of Small Business, Winter, 45-53.
- Schneider, B. (1983). An interactionist perspective on organizational effectiveness. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 27-54). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Seashore, S. E. (1983). A framework for an integrated model of organizational effectiveness. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 55-70). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Seashore, S. E., & Yuchtman, E. (1967). Factorial analysis of organizational performance. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 12, 377-395.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1983). Individual differences in productivity: An empirical test of estimates derived from studies of selection procedure validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 407-414.
- Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E. & Pearlman, K. (1982). Assessing the economic impact of personnel programs on workforce productivity. Personnel Psychology, 35, 333-347.

- Secrist, G. E. (1983). Human and organizational effectiveness: A total spectrum model. USAFSAM-TR-83-25. Brooks AFB, TX: USAF School of Aerospace Medicine.
- Silva, W., Ballentine, R. D., & Weaver, C. N. (1986). Productivity research and development planning workshop. AFHRL-TP-85-10. Brooks AFB, Texas: Manpower and Personnel Division.
- Simon, S. E. (1987). Productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness: Simple indicators of agency performance. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, February, 4-10.
- Smith, K. G., & Gannon, M. J. (1987). Organizational effectiveness in entrepreneurial and professionally managed firms. Journal of Small Business Management, 25, 14-22.
- Smith, P. C. (1976). Behaviors, results, and organizational effectiveness: The problem of criteria. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), The handbook of industrial-organizational psychology (pp. 745-768). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Starbuck, W. H., & Nystrom, P. C. (1983). Pursuing organizational effectiveness that is ambiguously specified. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 135-162). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Steers, R. M. (1975). Problems in the measurement of organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 20, 546-558.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Steers, R., Porter, L., Mowday, R., & Stone, E. (1975). Problems in the measurement of organizational effectiveness. TR No. 1, Contract No. N00014-76-C-0164, AD A018 709. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Office of Naval Research.
- Thompson, J. (1967). Organizations in action. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tuttle, T. C. (1981). Manager's guide to productivity improvement resources and programs. AFHRL-TP-81-12. Brooks AFB: Manpower and Personnel Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.
- Tuttle, T. C. (1983). Organizational productivity: A challenge for psychologists. American Psychologist, 38, 479-486.

- Tuttle, T. C., Wilkinson, R. E., Gatewood, W. L., & Lucke, L. (1981). Measuring and enhancing organizational productivity: An annotated bibliography. AFHRL-TP-81-6. Brooks AFB: Manpower and Personnel Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1983). Federal civil rights commitments: An assessment of enforcement resources and performance. Washington, D. C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights.
- Vaughn, R. (1975). The spoiled system. New York: Charterhouse.
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.
- Weick, K. E., & Daft, R. L. (1983). The effectiveness of interpretative systems. In K. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. (pp. 71-93). Academic Press: Orlando, FL.
- Weiner, Y. (1988). Forms of value systems: A focus on organizational effectiveness and cultural change and maintenance. Academy of Management Review, 13, 534-545.
- White, G. (1989). Retiring colonel helped lead fight against racism. Florida Today, 24, B-1.
- Witt, W. W. (1979). High performing units. Fort Monroe, VA: U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command: Task Force Delta.
- White, H. C. (1981). Personnel administration and organizational productivity: An employee view. Personnel Administrator, 26, 37-49.
- Zammuto, R. F. (1982). Assessing organizational effectiveness. Buffalo, NY: SUNY Press.
- Zammuto, R. F. (1984). A comparison of multiple constituency models of organizational effectiveness. Academy of Management Journal, 9, 606-616.
- Zenger, J. (1976). Increasing productivity: How behavioral scientists can help. Personnel Journal, 55, 513-515; 525-526.